

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The non-final office action of September 6, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 11-13, 21, 24, 26, 27, 35, 38 and 40 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 13 and 27 have been amended.

Claims 1, 8, 11-13, 21, 24, 26, 27, 35, 38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,509,912 to Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of US Patent No. 6,340,967 to Maxted ("Maxted"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action alleges that the combination of Moran and Maxted discloses the recited features of independent claims 1, 13 and 27. Regarding claim 1, the action alleges that Moran discloses all the features of claims 1, 13 and 27, but for a rendering system as claimed. To overcome this deficiency of Moran, the action relies on Maxted (Fig. 14; col. 13, line 47 – col. 14, line 67).

Amended claim 1 calls for, among other features, "a rendering system for *rendering a file save interface* in response to the input system receiving the file save command, the input system configured to receive in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by the computer system in the file save interface ... wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes *an electronic ink filename* for the document or file." (Emphasis added). Maxted describes receiving electronic ink in a user defined word list box 112 "which allows a user to add, delete or modify existing words" in a dictionary. Col. 13, lines 42-46. The word list box 112 contains a word list writing window 125 that receives "input in the form of Electronic Ink, which is interpreted by Handwriting Recognition Software into ASCII, after a handwriting time-out occurs". Col. 14, lines 4-9. The displayed word can then be added (in ASCII) to the dictionary via an add command.

In stark contrast to claim 1, Maxted neither teaches nor suggests rendering *a file save interface* in response to the input system receiving the file save command, the input system configured to receive in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file, wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes *an electronic ink filename* for the document or file. The word list box 112 is nothing remotely close to a file save interface and selection of an

add command does not render a file save interface. Indeed, the add command simply saves the word in ASCII form to the dictionary. Moreover, the word added to the dictionary does not constitute an electronic ink filename for the dictionary or any file or document.

Therefore, the combination of Moran and Maxted, even if proper, fails to result in the claim 1 combination of features. For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Moran and Maxted. Claims 8, 11, and 12, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are patentably distinct from the combination of Moran and Maxted for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Independent claim 13 as amended calls for, among other features, “displaying a file save interface responsive to receiving the file save command ... wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink filename for the document or file.” Independent claim 27 as amended calls for, among other features, displaying a file save interface for receiving electronic ink responsive to receiving the file save command ... wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink filename for the document or file.” Thus, for substantially the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 1, the combination of Moran and Maxted even if proper, does not result in the invention of claims 13 and 27. Claims 21, 24, and 26, which ultimately depend from claim 13, and claims 35, 38, and 40, which ultimately depend from claim 27, are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Moran and Maxted for at least the same reasons as their respective ultimate base claims and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Appln. No.: 10/690,669  
Amendment dated December 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2007

**CONCLUSION**

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 5, 2007

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001